



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1995

No. 109

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, June 19, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chaplain will now deliver the opening prayer.

PRAYER

Father of liberty, as we begin this Fourth of July weekend and recess time, we praise You for our Founding Fathers who received from You the strength and courage to claim their inalienable right to be free and drafted the Declaration of Independence. You gave them victory in a just revolution and placed in their hearts the American dream. We join our voices with these gallant heroes of liberty in confessing total dependence on You. We know that You are the Author of the glorious vision that gave birth to our beloved Nation.

Through the years we have learned that freedom is not free. It must be cherished, defended, and fought for at high cost. We thank You for the brave men and women who have given their lives in the cause of freedom and justice. Today, help us to be willing to pay the cost of freedom as we lead our Nation. We give You our minds, hearts, and energy as we grapple with the issues of moving this Nation forward in keeping with Your vision. As the fireworks explode in the sky in our Fourth of July celebrations, implode in our hearts a new burst of patriotism and commitment. God, empower the women and men of this Senate and bless America. In Your holy name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, this morning the leader time has been reserved, and there will be a period for morning business until the hour of 10:30 a.m.

The rescissions bill is expected to arrive from the House of Representatives today, and Senator DOLE, our majority leader, has indicated he would like to complete action on that bill today. Rollcall votes are therefore possible during today's session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

FREEDOM OR SECURITY?

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, this coming Tuesday, the American people will celebrate the Fourth of July. It is a day for parties and parades, fireworks, and family picnics.

It is a day for remembering the bedrock of freedom on which this country was built, and how freedom still binds us together.

So it is ironic that 1 day later, July 5, we will take action right here on Capitol Hill to clamp down on the very freedoms we embrace on Independence Day.

It began on April 19, in Oklahoma City.

The reverberations of the bombing at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building were felt across America, but echoed loudly in Washington, DC, home to more Federal buildings—and Federal employees—than any other city in the Nation.

And almost immediately, a siege mentality took hold.

Here at the Capitol, police took extraordinary steps to protect against the possibility of a terrorist attack.

They beefed up patrols around the building, stopped cars and checked

trunks, eliminated parking in some areas, increased the sensitivity on the entryway metal detectors, and kept the public away from ground floor windows with yards of yellow tape labeled "Police Line—Do Not Cross."

Soon after, the U.S. Treasury Department ordered Pennsylvania Avenue closed to cars and trucks in front of the White House.

For the first time in the 195-year history of the Executive Mansion, the people were no longer allowed to drive past the people's house.

And now, 1 month after Pennsylvania Avenue was shut down to traffic, police say more drastic measures are needed. A plan will go into effect here on Wednesday, July 5, that will even further limit the people's access to Capitol Hill and those of us who work here on the people's behalf.

The Senate Sergeant-at-Arms and the U.S. Capitol Police say that traffic will be restricted or eliminated altogether around the three Senate office buildings.

Some parking will be eliminated, too.

Streets will be closed with the concrete barriers that have become all-too-common in this city. It will be more tire shredders, not "welcome" signs, that will greet visitors.

The Capitol Police say they are trying to strike a balance between free access, and the security of the Congress and its visitors.

They say the changes I have outlined mean only "minor traffic disruptions" and will have "little impact on the community."

Mr. President, I have great admiration and respect for the officers and police administrators who work every day—sometimes putting their own lives on the line—to make this a safe and secure place to work and visit.

They have and deserve our thanks. But with all due respect to them, there is much more at stake in this decision

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S9479

than simply its physical impact on the community.

Whenever we make such bold moves to further separate ourselves from the very people who sent us here and pay our weekly salaries, it has a tremendous impact on the national psyche as well.

What it comes down to, Mr. President, is the question of freedom versus security. Is ours a government that can operate openly, in the name of freedom, and still shut itself off from the people, in the name of security?

Are we willing to swap one for the other?

If we are, then perhaps we should not stop with a few tire shredders and a couple of closed streets.

Why do not we just build a fence around the Capitol? That is what the Capitol Hill Police proposed in 1985 in an internal report, at a cost then of \$2.8 million.

Or better yet, if we really want to make a loud, public statement that "you cannot mess with the Federal Government," we will dig a massive trench around the Capitol.

We will fill the moat with water and maybe a pack of alligators, and build a single, drawbridge entrance, where we will station guards armed with spears.

And then we will dare the public to visit.

We will be secure in our bunker, Mr. President, but for that security, we will be trading away freedom, and we cannot make horse trades with the very principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. President, we should also consider the impact of our actions on the taxpayers.

The recent security precautions taken at the White House will cost the taxpayers \$200,000 for new traffic signals, signs, and pavement markings.

The new security arrangements here at the Capitol will come with a price tag to the taxpayers as well, although the costs will not be measured solely by dollars.

Where do we stop?

There are 8,100 Federal buildings in the United States—do we turn each and every one of them into a fortress?

The sad truth is that we can not protect Federal workers by sealing them off from the world.

If we tell terrorists that we are not going to let them park car bombs made of fertilizer and fuel oil next to our Federal buildings anymore, they will find another way.

And we may just be goading on a desperate kook who wants to prove they can not be stopped by another layer of security.

The public does not understand what we are doing.

They have vital business in Federal buildings, or they come here as tourists, expecting to be welcomed.

But when they see the police, and all they yellow tape, and the signs that say "Do Not Enter," they wonder what kind of message we are trying to get across.

I have heard their comments when they look down an empty stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue that used to be open to cars. I know what they whisper when they visit and walk through the metal detectors.

"It is a shame," they are saying.

And they do not like it. We have gone too far.

Washington should be a place where visitors feel secure, but by turning it into a fortress, we are sacrificing freedom for security, and making a city of such beauty and such history something dirty.

We can put in more concrete barriers and try to camouflage them with flowers, but in the words of one newspaper columnist, it is like putting lipstick on a goat. It is ugly, and fear is ugly.

Democracy should be about building bridges, not building walls. In Washington, we have become too adept at building walls. And every time a wall goes up, we knock freedom down another notch.

Let us seriously consider what we're doing, and what security we're willing to give up in order to live in a democracy.

If in the end it comes down to a question of security or freedom, this Senator will always choose freedom, Mr. President. And I believe the American people will, too.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes; under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes; under the previous order, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes. The Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am informed that Senator CRAIG is not going to utilize his time. My name was not mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SECOND RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, at 10 o'clock, I understand, the Senate will take up a second rescissions bill, that bill having passed the House of Representatives last night. This is good news for the people of the United States, following on the even better news of the passage of the budget resolution yesterday, a budget resolution which will lead to a balanced budget in the year 2002. That path will be made markedly easier by the passage and hoped-for signing of a rescissions bill designed to save somewhere between \$12 and \$15 billion of spending already authorized and appropriated. In fact, next year's appropriations would be extremely difficult without the passage of this rescissions bill.

Regrettably, it will allow somewhat more spending, at the insistence of the President, than was the case with the earlier proposal. But even so, it will represent a major step forward, a significant commitment on the part of this Congress to a leaner, tougher, more efficient and more effective Federal Government with a reduction in spending which, in some cases, would simply be wasteful—in other cases, which might have been significant, but not of a high enough priority to borrow in order to do it and then to send the bill to our children and to our grandchildren.

One of the last matters, perhaps the last matter settled in connection with this rescissions bill, was a proposal of mine and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] with respect to salvage timber and to certain other rules related to timber harvesting in the Pacific Northwest—the salvage provisions applying all across the United States.

Negotiations with the administration on this subject were intensive and were lengthy. The net result, from the perspective of this Senator, is that the changes in the earlier bill are only slightly more than superficial. Both the provisions in the earlier bill and those in this bill, I wish to emphasize, were aimed solely at permitting the President and the administration to do what they claim they want to do anyway, to keep their own commitments. Neither in the field of salvage timber nor in connection with so-called option 9 in the Pacific Northwest, do I believe this administration proposes a balance between its environmental concerns and the very real, human needs of the people who live in timber communities and supply a vitally important commodity for the people of the United States.

I wish to emphasize this. I do not believe the administration's plans are appropriately balanced or that they give due weight to human concerns. But they are something. They are more than people in timber country across the United States have today. This amendment is simply designed to remove the frivolous and endless litigation which seeks to obstruct even the